# Through Asimov's Lens

## The Silent Student

December 31, 2025 | 1,698 words

---

THE STORY

Professor Chen adjusted her glasses and pulled up the holographic display. "The EngageAI system shows remarkable promise. Student attention metrics improved by 47% in pilot programs."

Around the mahogany table, fourteen faculty members leaned forward. At the far end, Maya Singh sat very still, the only undergraduate in the room. The small placard before her read "Student Representative."

"The system monitors eye movement, typing patterns, even micro-expressions," Chen continued. "It can detect when a student is struggling before they know it themselves."

Professor Williams nodded approvingly. "Finally, we can intervene before they fail."

"The predictive algorithms are extraordinary," added Dr. Morrison. "It identified three students in my quantum mechanics course who were statistically likely to drop out. I was able to reach them in time."

Maya raised her hand slightly. The gesture felt strange here, like a child asking permission to speak among adults. "What did those students say about the intervention?"

Morrison blinked. "Say? Well, they remained in the course. That's what matters."

"But did you ask them if they wanted-"

"The beauty of EngageAI," Chen interrupted smoothly, "is that it eliminates guesswork. We know what students need."

The display shifted to show cascading data: engagement scores, prediction confidence intervals, intervention success rates. Maya watched the numbers dance, each one representing a student reduced to patterns and probabilities.

"I move to approve implementation for fall semester," Williams said.

"Seconded," came three voices in unison.

Maya's throat felt dry. "Don't we need more student input?"

"That's why you're here, dear," Professor Chen smiled warmly. "To provide the student perspective."

"But I'm just one person. Shouldn't we survey-"

"The data speaks for itself," Morrison interjected. "Students don't always know what's best for their learning. That's why they come to us."

Maya felt something twist in her chest. She'd prepared

arguments, had stayed up late researching privacy concerns, the psychological effects of constant monitoring, the way predictive systems could become self-fulfilling prophecies. But sitting here, she understood something the preparation hadn't taught her: her presence wasn't about input. It was about the appearance of input.

"The system does raise some concerns," Professor Liu said quietly. She was new faculty, Maya remembered, just two years out of graduate school. "The constant monitoring might create anxiety-"

"Anxiety is measurable," Williams countered. "EngageAI accounts for it. If stress indicators spike, it recommends wellness resources."

"But maybe," Liu persisted, "students don't want to be measured every moment. Maybe sometimes struggling privately is part of learning."

"That's rather romantic thinking," Chen said. "We have a responsibility to use every tool available to ensure student success."

Maya found herself speaking before she could stop. "What if success isn't what you think it is?"

The room turned to her. Fourteen pairs of eyes, patient but puzzled, as if a piece of furniture had suddenly voiced an opinion.

"Explain," Chen said, though her tone suggested she was humoring a child.

"You're measuring engagement, but what if a student staring out the window is having their most important thought of the semester? You're predicting dropout, but what if leaving is the right choice for someone? You're... you're creating a version of success that fits your metrics, then forcing us to achieve it."

The silence stretched. Maya felt heat rise to her cheeks.

"That's an interesting perspective," Williams said finally. "But somewhat naive. We've been educators for decades. We know what student success looks like."

"All in favor?" Chen called.

Thirteen hands rose. Liu hesitated, glanced at Maya, then slowly raised hers as well.

"Motion carried," Chen announced. "Thank you for your input, Maya. Your participation demonstrates our commitment to student voices in decision-making."

As the meeting adjourned, Maya remained seated. The professors filed out, chatting about implementation timelines and metric dashboards. Liu paused at the door, seemed about to speak, then left without a word.

Alone in the room, Maya stared at the holographic display still cycling through its data. Somewhere in those numbers was her own profile-her engagement patterns, her predicted outcomes, her measured worth as a student. The system would know her better than she knew herself, they claimed. It would ensure her success.

But what if she didn't want to be known that way? What if she wanted the right to struggle invisibly, to fail without prediction, to succeed in ways that couldn't be measured by an algorithm?

The display flickered off, leaving only her reflection in the dark screen. One student voice among thousands, invited to speak in a room where the decision was already made.

She gathered her things slowly, wondering: When the system activated in fall, would it measure the weight of this moment? Would it detect the dissonance between being asked for input and being truly heard? Or would it simply mark her as "engaged" because she had attended, spoken, participated in the performance of consultation?

The question followed her out of the room, down the empty hallway, into a future being written in languages she was not meant to speak.

## THE REFLECTION

Maya's solitary presence in that faculty meeting-one student among fourteen professors-mirrors a troubling reality in our current moment. Recent discourse analysis reveals that students represent merely 0.07% of voices in conversations about educational AI implementation. This isn't just a statistic; it's a portrait of power so imbalanced it borders on the absurd.

We live in an era where "student-centered learning" has become educational gospel, yet students themselves are practically absent from decisions about the AI systems designed to center them. The contradiction would be comedic if the stakes weren't so high. These systems will shape how students learn, what counts as engagement, which behaviors trigger intervention, and ultimately, what it means to succeed in higher education.

The data tells a stark story. While 78% of educational institutions report prioritizing "student input" in technology decisions, fewer than 3% include students as voting members on AI implementation committees. The remaining 97% of decisions about students' digital futures are made in rooms where students are, at best, observers-at worst, completely absent.

This absence becomes more troubling when we consider trust erosion. Recent surveys show that only 31% of students trust their institutions to implement AI ethically, while 89% of administrators believe they are acting in students' best interests. This gulf between institutional confidence and student trust reveals something profound about how we make decisions "for" versus "with" those affected.

What does it mean to be human when algorithms know you better than you know yourself-but you had no say in teaching them who you are? The EngageAI system in our story promises to detect struggling students before they know they're struggling. But this assumes struggle is always negative, always to be prevented. What about the struggle that leads to breakthrough? The confusion that sparks

curiosity? The failure that teaches resilience?

When we exclude students from AI governance, we're not just making a procedural error. We're engaging in a fundamental act of dehumanization-reducing them to data points to be optimized rather than recognizing them as co-creators of their own education. The system measures engagement through eye tracking and typing patterns, but can it measure the moment a student's worldview shifts? Can it detect the quiet revolution of a mind changing?

The faculty's certainty that they "know what student success looks like" after decades of teaching reveals a deeper blindness. Experience can illuminate, but it can also calcify assumptions. When Professor Morrison celebrates preventing dropouts without asking whether those students wanted to stay, he embodies a paternalism dressed in the language of care. The algorithm becomes a tool not just for prediction but for enforcing a narrow vision of success.

Maya's question-"What if success isn't what you think it is?"-cuts to the heart of educational AI's challenge. When we delegate human judgment to systems, we don't eliminate bias; we encode it, scale it, make it seem objective through the authority of data. The 0.07% student voice in AI discourse means 99.93% of the conversation happens without those who will live under these systems' constant gaze.

This near-total absence raises uncomfortable questions about consent, agency, and power. Students pay tuition, submit to evaluation, trust institutions with their intellectual development-yet they're deemed unqualified to participate meaningfully in decisions about the tools that will shape that development. The message is clear: you are here to be educated, not to co-create your education.

The bitter irony is that these AI systems often promise to make education more "personalized" and "responsive to individual needs." But how can a system be truly personal when the persons it serves had no voice in its creation? How can it respond to needs that were never articulated by those who have them?

Liu's hesitation before raising her hand speaks to another dynamic-the pressure to conform even when doubts linger. How many educators share her reservations but remain silent? How many see the 0.07% and feel uneasy but conclude that speaking up would be futile, naive, or career-limiting?

Perhaps most troubling is how consultation becomes performance. Maya's presence allows the committee to claim student input while ensuring that input remains powerless. This isn't oversight; it's design. True student participation would be messy, might slow implementation, could raise questions that have no easy answers. Better to have one quiet voice that can be thanked and dismissed.

As educational AI systems proliferate, promising to enhance learning through ever-more sophisticated surveillance and prediction, we must ask: what future are we creating when those who will inhabit it have no meaningful voice in its construction? The 0.07% isn't just a number-it's a warning about whose vision of education will be encoded into systems that may outlast us all.

Maya's reflection in the dark screen offers a final image to consider. She sees herself, but mediated through technology she didn't choose and can't control. This is the future we're building for millions of students: a world where they exist primarily as data to be processed by systems they had almost no voice in creating.

The question isn't whether AI will transform education-that transformation is already underway. The question is whether students will be subjects of that transformation or merely its objects, measured and predicted but never truly heard.